

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/324,741	Applicant(s) DELAND, ROBERT S.	
	Examiner Mark Tremblay	Art Unit 2876	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mark Tremblay. (3) _____.

(2) David Bailey. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 24 March 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-23.


Identification of prior art discussed: Indeck and Fernandez.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant asserted that proposed amendments to recast the claims to reflect the combination of range data with characteristic data would define over the prior art. Examiner did not agree, and stated that further search and consideration would be required to address the issue properly.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


MARK TREMBLAY
BY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required